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ABSTRACT

Physical Place and Online Space: Permeability, Embodiment, and Gender in Two Online, Synchronous Critical Multicultural Teacher Education Courses

Elizabeth Finlayson Harris
Department of Teacher Education, BYU
Master of Arts

This semester-long microethnography explores how the emotional geography in two online, synchronous critical multicultural education courses are shaped by online interactions and infrastructures as well as social frames. Using a microethnographic approach, video data, interviews, and open-ended questionnaires revealed patterns of interactions suggesting an online emotional geography characterized by a duality of physical place and online space. Key findings suggest that the levels of permeability in student and instructor’s physical location influence how online participants gave or received emotion gifts and performances in online spaces. This study further supports emergent research suggesting gender frames as relevant in students’ level of online participation and instructors’ perception of professionalism. Implications include an increased level of emotion work as instructors and students manage complex identities in online classrooms. Furthermore, online instructors should be aware of the unique characteristics of the online emotional geography as they seek to create more equitable online communities of learning.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In the last 50 years, educational research on emotions has increased regarding student learning (Goleman, 1995; Schutz et al., 2007; Sylwester, 1994; Vail, 1994; Zembylas & Schutz, 2016), cognition (Linnenbrink, 2006; Zembylas, 2005a), identity (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Zembylas, 2003a, 2003b, 2005b), and engagement (Kahu, 2013; Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2012; Schutz et al., 2007). Nevertheless, the study of emotion in education has historically been difficult, partially due to the lack of consistently defined definitions (Boler, 1999; Zembylas, 2007). In response to this difficulty, emotional experiences in education are often operationalized into two distinct ways: affect and emotion. Affect constitutes the embodied feelings or physiological responses of individuals, while emotion represents the interpersonal expression and social meanings of an individual’s affect. While both affect and emotion are relevant to the experiences of individuals in classroom settings, this study will primarily focus on emotion as it is expressed in an online learning environment.

Emotions, in the context of education, have often been dichotomously framed: individual versus social, spontaneous versus meditated, and feeling versus thought (Lupton, 1998; Savage, 2004; Zembylas, 2007). While at times helpful, this binary viewpoint may limit and reduce the richness of our understanding of emotional experiences within educational research (Williams, 2001; Zembylas, 2007). Working to mend this division, a feminist theory of emotion proves useful. Specifically, this tradition emphasizes that hegemonic social, cultural, and political discourses and interpersonal interactions work together to produce emotion (Butler, 1990; Game & Metcalfe, 1996; Lupton, 1998; Rosaldo, 1984). In other words, feminist theories of emotion seek to mend the divide between the personal and social experiences of emotion.
Congruent with this feminist approach, the concept of “emotional geographies” explores the construction of emotions as both socially organized and interpersonally exchanged (Hargreaves, 2001, p. 1061). Specifically, emotional geographies seek to highlight how the social, physical, professional, and ideological structures surrounding and within schooling impact the emotional experiences of students, teachers, administrators, and parents. For example, the organization of elementary schools in the U.S. is relatively consistent. Students are with a single teacher, with consistent classroom peers for eight hours during a school day. Thus, interactions in elementary classrooms across the U.S. are consistently influenced by the same social organization making them generalizable and patterned (Hargreaves, 1998, 2000, 2001). Similarly in secondary classrooms, socially organized structures of schooling influence classroom interactions that in turn, reveal the emotional geography of a classroom (Holloway & Jöns, 2012).

While Hargreaves (1998) pioneered this theory in elementary and secondary classrooms, little research has yet to be conducted surrounding the emotional geographies of higher education classrooms. Higher education classrooms are organized differently from elementary or secondary classrooms. Higher education classrooms often vary in their academic structure (lecture or discussion), class size, learning platform (online, hybrid, or in-person) and reasons why students may opt to take the course (fulfill a general or gain admission to a particular major). However, there are some commonalities across higher education courses. Usually, some form of tuition is required to attend the school, and students are often asked and expected to be self-directed and self-motivated. Additionally, higher education students are typically between the ages of 18-30, may have financial pressures, including acquiring some amount of debt, and are generally motivated to finish their degree in a timely manner. At many four-year universities, many
instructors hold doctorate degrees as experts in their field, design their own curriculum, and are often subject to student reviews. These examples of structural characteristics of higher education highlight just a few ways in which the organization of higher education may dramatically differ from the organization of K-12 public education.

Higher education courses that present significant organizational and interpersonal patterns of interest are critical multicultural education courses. These courses are often dialogical, fraught with student resistance, contain high amounts of student interaction, and are often politically and emotionally charged (Cutri & Whiting, 2015; Cutri, Whiting, & Bybee, 2020; Gorski, 2002, 2006, 2009a, 2009b, 2012; Gorski & Covert, 2010; Whiting & Cutri, 2019). For example, interactions and discussions within multicultural education courses often include student resistance to content, a call to commit to issues of educational equity, discussions surrounding unequal power relations such as race or gender, and the introduction of emotional coping strategies for those navigating experiences of oppression within the American education system (Gorski, 2002, 2006, 2009a, 2009b, 2012; Gorski & Covert, 2010). While not all higher education courses examine such emotional topics, exploring the emotional geography of a higher education classroom that centers around emotional content may provide a nuanced perspective of the emotional interactions of higher education classrooms; specifically, classrooms geared toward social justice and equity.

Finally, investigating teacher and student interactions within multicultural education classrooms is not only confined to in-person classroom settings (Cutri, Whiting, & Bybee, 2020). While accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, online classroom settings in higher education have been commonly offered in synchronous and asynchronous ways (Watts, 2016). Using a variety of online learning platforms, such as Zoom, synchronous classrooms allow professors
and students to video call into a common space at a specific time and day in lieu of meeting in a physical classroom space. While online, synchronous classrooms may become reduced in frequency following the end of the COVID-19 pandemic, these classrooms may be here to stay, introducing yet another organizational component into higher education classrooms. Therefore, understanding how classrooms are organized and the types of interactions that characterize the emotional geography of an online, synchronous higher education classroom remains an important question for those in higher education classrooms now and in the future.

To explore this new emotional geography, I will use the following question to guide my inquiry: What types of classroom infrastructures and interactions characterize the emotional geography of two online, synchronous multicultural education courses? In the next section, I will introduce research literature on emotions in education and emotional geographies aimed at understanding online student interactions and classroom organization that will serve as a guide for data analysis.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

Emotions in the Classroom

Emotions have become a key point of focus for many educational researchers within the last half-decade (Clough, 2007; Zembylas, 2007, 2021). Research has suggested that students and teachers experience both positive and negative emotions in the classroom (Boler, 1999; Christie et al., 2008; Finlayson et al., 2021; Hargreaves, 2000; Hatt, 2012; Zembylas, 2020), perform or hide their emotions (Clark, 2004; Cutri & Whiting, 2015; Finlayson et al., 2021; Whiting, 2021; Whiting & Cutri, 2019; Zembylas, 2005b), and credit emotions as being a significant factor for satisfaction in learning and teaching (Day & Leitch, 2001; Goleman, 1995; Hargreaves, 1998, 2000, 2001).

The way in which emotions are framed within educative settings affects the ways in which researchers, teachers, and students encounter, describe, define, and problematize emotions (Zembylas, 2007). If emotions are psychologized, they tend to be defined as embodied and are highly individual and physiological in nature, or affective (Zembylas, 2007, 2021). In contrast, emotions can also be defined as the social meaning and expression of affect and are socially analyzed through the interactions and behaviors of individuals in particular contexts (Ahmed, 2004; Clark, 2004; Clough, 2007; Zembylas, 2007). Additionally, emotions can also be seen in a post-structural lens as interactional, performative, and changing moment to moment (Savage, 2004; Zembylas, 2007). Differentiating between emotion and affect, researchers suggest emotions “produce the very boundaries that allow the individual and the group to interact” (Zembylas, 2007, p. 63).
Classrooms are ideal spaces to study emotion as they bring together individuals with differing viewpoints, experiences, and opinions into a shared space. Classrooms often require students to achieve an emotional understanding of each other and connect in ways that foster empathy and respect (Denzin, 1994). For instance, high school students may experience dismay as their life experiences are ignored, teachers may become defensive after being accused of not caring, or kindergarteners may become visibly upset when the requirement to sit still becomes too much to handle. In each of these examples, emotion is expressed in relation to others, but confined within a social infrastructure where expressing certain emotions are allowed or prohibited (Boler, 1999; Butler, 1990; Hargreaves, 2000; Hochschild, 1979, 2012; Zembylas, 2007).

**Emotions: Social Infrastructures**

Social infrastructures of K-12 schooling influence how, why, and where teachers and students interact and the effects of those interactions relationally (Hargreaves, 1998, 2000, 2001; Ridgeway, 2009). These infrastructures are comprised of the physical and psychosocial boundaries that impact the ways in which individuals relate to each other in the classroom (Hargreaves, 2001; Ridgeway, 2009). For example, the infrastructure of elementary grades (K-6) allows teachers and their students to be together for a continuous 8-hour period over the course of an entire school year. As a result of this infrastructure, elementary school teachers and students often have more positively and negatively intense emotional interactions compared to their secondary counterparts (Hargreaves, 2000, 2001) where teachers spend less time with greater numbers of students. This is just one example of how the infrastructure of schools influence the ways in which teachers and students experience and express emotion.
The infrastructure within K-12 classrooms and schooling systems are also mostly consistent across age groupings. Most elementary schools are organized and bound around a single teacher, students staying with the same peers throughout the school year, and often have smaller class sizes. In contrast, secondary (7-12) schools are often organized around teachers who specialize in a particular subject, have students attend class with different peers for each class during a limited amount of time per week, and in which class sizes are generally larger than in elementary schools. Because these socially organized institutional boundaries exist across many elementary and secondary schools, the patterns or characteristics of teachers and student interactions are often similar within elementary and secondary schools (Hargreaves, 2000, 2001). Thus, the infrastructure within elementary and secondary schools promotes or suppresses different types of teacher-student and student-student interaction.

The general patterns of emotional closeness or distance and their patterned interaction as influenced by classroom infrastructure are what constitute an “emotional geography” (Hargreaves, 2001, p. 1061). When analyzed closely, these emotional geographies often reveal larger emotion norms and rules (Hochschild, 1979, 2012; Thoits, 2004). As a single theory, emotional geographies attend both to the interactions of individuals, and the infrastructure of classrooms and schools. However, by adding a feminist perspective, emotional geographies can also conceptualize emotions as being inherently connected to power (Ahmed, 2004; Boler, 1999; Butler, 1990; Clark, 2004; Hochschild, 1979; Savage, 2004; Zembylas, 2007).

**Emotions: Classroom Interactions**

Emotions can be conceptualized as interactionally expressed and having social, cultural, and political value and meaning (Hargreaves, 2001). In this sense, emotions cycle between individuals in an “affective economy” where certain emotions can be expressed for greater social
status or opportunity (Ahmed, 2004, p. 119). As an example, Ahmed (2004) references the circulation of patriotic expressions of love in the U.S. following the September 11 attack. Patriotic expressions of love were exchanged for the opportunity to belong in and to one’s community and nation. In these transactions, emotions were performed and exchanged in a specific context of power relations and meanings (Ahmed, 2004; Butler, 1990; Clark, 2004; Hochschild, 1979; Mega et al., 2014; Zembylas, 2005b, 2015, 2020).

Emotions may be performed in a variety of ways. Hochschild (1979) referenced the performance of emotion work as the act of personally expressing certain emotions while suppressing others within specific contexts. While emotion work is performed within personal settings, emotion labor draws attention to the expression or suppression of specific emotions often required by one’s profession to maintain a positive job performance (Hochschild, 1979, 2012). Teachers often perform emotion labor as much of teaching involves expressing or suppressing specific emotions that invite students’ attention and encourage certain behavior (Ogbonna & Harris, 2004; Ybema & Smulders, 2002). For instance, the teaching profession often carries an emotional expectation for teachers to be patient and caring which requires a certain amount of emotion labor, especially when teachers may be exhausted or frustrated (Näring et al., 2012). Therefore, teaching is one job that requires a performance of emotional labor.

While not commonly thought of as a job, being a student also requires a certain amount of emotion labor (Whiting, 2021). Students must frequently perform emotion labor to suppress certain emotions, such as anger to appease the teacher (Jagger, 1989). While students may not be fired from being a student, they may be subjected to specific punishments or excluded from classroom activities as demonstrated by junior high school students who cited the need to
perform the emotional labor of smiling and expressing niceness to others to achieve a sense of belonging (Clark, 2004; Whiting, 2021). In other words, students performed emotion labor to conform to the expectations of being a student. In return for the performance of their emotion labor, they received the social reward of belonging and being included in a group membership. Thus, being a student is also a job that requires a performance of emotion labor, and an understanding of which emotions are normal, appropriate, or inappropriate within classroom settings (Boler, 1999; Butler, 1990; Hatt, 2012; Hochschild, 1979; Jagger, 1989; Thoits, 2004; Whiting, 2021).

Emotion gifts are another type of emotional performance that often encourage a sense of friendship, respect, or intimacy (Clark, 2004; Denzin, 1994). For example, a student expressing gratitude or appreciation for their teacher often produces feelings of fondness and increases a perceived sense of teacher-student intimacy (Clark, 2004; Hatt, 2012). Emotion gifts may also be verbally or physically expressed such as when a student sits up straight and uses their body to show attention or when a teacher is curious about the activities or interests of their students. In each of these instances, emotion gifts may be exchanged for greater status but are more often used to promote friendship, intimacy, and connection (Clark, 2004; Whiting, 2021). However, for emotion gifts to encourage friendship, intimacy, and respect they must be seen as sincerely expressed by both parties (Cutri & Whiting, 2015; Whiting & Cutri, 2019).

In contrast to the above, students may choose to not perform emotion work, labor, or gifts. Rather, students may choose to actively reject emotional conformity by performing socially ‘outlawed’ emotions such as anger, frustration, defiance, and combativeness (Jagger, 1989). However, expressions of apathy may also be classified as non-conforming within classroom contexts as students are often expected to be attentive, alert, and participatory. As such, for a
student to give a nonconforming emotional performance, they must understand which emotions they are being asked to express and choose to counter the socially prescribed emotion (Gorski, 2002, 2006, 2009a, 2012). Performing nonconforming emotions often serves to challenge power and authority and establish one's identity outside of a group (Finlayson et al., 2021; Jagger, 1989; Thoits, 2004). Individuals may find it easier to be emotionally nonconforming relative to their social position, such as their race, gender, class, or other social characteristics. For example, those with social power (White, male, cisgender, heterosexual) are typically not subjected to severe sanctions as compared to individuals outside of positionalities of power (Hochschild, 2012). Therefore, those who find themselves in lower-status positions such as female, a person of color, non-conforming gender identity, or children may not be in a position of power to frequently express nonconforming emotions.

Emotional performances in all varieties may require emotion work, or labor, and can take the form of gifts or nonconformity in classroom settings. This categorization demonstrates the interactional and socially constructed value of emotions within socially constructed contexts of power. These highlight the contextually political nature of emotional performances. In other words, the emotional performances of individuals are almost always in reference to more powerful others, or to the normative hegemonic discourses that dictate societal interactions.

**Emotions: Primary Frames**

Hargreaves (1998, 2000, 2001) developed the theory of classroom emotional geographies with emphasis and attention on how classroom interactions are organizationally structured. However, the theory of emotional geographies does not attend to how individuals are framed by their social position or status in society before they enter the classroom. The “primary frames,” of gender, race, and class are essential to everyday social norms surrounding interactions and
institutional possibilities (Ridgeway, 2009, p. 145). Through these frames, individuals come to define themselves, and are defined by others in terms of social categories of difference. While these differences are not inherently unequal, they are often transformed into inequality through various social processes (Ridgeway, 2009).

Exploring emotion rules is one such way to look at how social categories of difference may influence unequal power relations between groups. For example, emotions in Eurocentric societies have historically, culturally, institutionally, and religiously been related to and embodied by women (Boler, 1999). Through this association of women and emotions, emotions in patriarchal societies have often been relegated as unnecessary, frivolous, containing little value, and inferior within patriarchal cultures (Boler, 1999).

These societal rules surrounding emotion are reinforced through schooling as students learn to discipline their emotions to conform to specific social contexts and thereby gain access to interpersonal power (Boler, 1999; Hatt, 2012; Jagger, 1989; Whiting, 2021). For example, Hatt (2012) documented specific emotional and behavior conformity in kindergarten that functioned to establish boundaries of status and power in the classroom. These included sitting quietly, raising one’s hand, and talking at ‘appropriate’ levels that allow Kindergarten children access to be “like” the teacher — occupying greater power, authority, and autonomy — as they gain status and recognition as helping to teach their fellow classmates (Hatt, 2012). This messaging continues throughout schooling as children learn to self-regulate their emotions, internalizing patriarchal codes of power that indicate that emotional expressions are suspect and must be carefully controlled (Boler, 1999; Butler, 1990).

These patriarchal ideologies have additionally positioned emotions as “individualized and privatized” often perpetuating the idea that emotions are not something to be discussed or paid
attention to (Boler, 1999, p. 44). However, studying emotions experienced by women on the micro-scale exposes macro-normative, hegemonic inequity through emotion norms and experiences (Boler, 2013; Butler, 1990, 1993; Cahill, 2007; Leavitt, 1996; Lupton, 1998). In other words, feminist scholars challenge and expose the power of normative discourse through examining personal experiences within political contexts (Boler & Zembylas, 2016; Butler, 1990; Collins, 2012; hooks, 2014). Although these scholars have done significant work in unpacking and understanding the role of emotions in social spaces as providing access to power within institutions, this work often goes unrecognized (Boler, 1999). The contributions of these theoretical approaches, however, emerge in new research looking at the affective turn in education (Clough, 2007).

Taking the “personal as political,” the theory of emotional geographies is founded on the interplay of personal interactions and the institutional or structural framing of classrooms (Hanisch, 1970). Specifically, the theory of emotional geographies describes five types of institutional frames: sociocultural, moral, physical, professional, and political frameworks. These encompass how teachers and students see themselves culturally, how teachers and students physically interact with each other and the environment, and the ways in which teachers and students hold themselves in relation to expectations of professionalism. However, placing political or power interactions within its own category is insufficient and largely understated. Separating the emotions of political interactions from sociocultural, physical, moral, and professional interactions fails to situate power as organized, embodied, and accessed through the primary frames of gender, race, sexuality, and class (Boler, 1999; Butler, 1990, 1993; Denzin, 1994; Hochschild, 1979; Zembylas, 2007, 2015). For example, a teacher’s feelings towards a student’s specific culture and aspirations are inherently tied to primary frames of race, gender,
and class (Hatt, 2012). Therefore, power relations between social groups are tied up within sociocultural, physical, moral, and professional interactions. In other words, Hargreaves’ sociocultural, moral, physical, and professional geographies all operate within a socio-political emotional geography.

**Emotions in the Critical Multicultural Classroom**

With the above framework, this study situates itself within two critical multicultural education courses for undergraduate students who are pre-service teachers. Multicultural education courses are often challenging as equity-oriented teacher education must engage preservice teachers in personal, and often emotional, reflection and discussion of a range of topics (Cutri & Whiting, 2015) to prepare them to teach students from a wide variety of backgrounds.

Resistance to critical multicultural education subject matter is common (Gorski, 2002, 2009a, 2009b, 2012; Grant et al., 2018; Lawyer, 2018; Ndemanu, 2018; Tatum, 1992; Young, 2020; Zembylas, 2018). Student resistance related to an instructor’s social position such as race, language, sexuality, and intersectionality can be related to “students’ implicit or explicit resistance” (Dunn et al., 2014, p. 94) in multicultural teacher education courses. For example, Dunn noted her privilege as a White instructor during conversations of White privilege, as teacher candidates perceived her as an objective observer and not someone who has personally experienced racism (Dunn et al., 2014). Additionally, issues surrounding equity can be difficult for students who are encountering critical social justice and privilege for the first time during pre-service preparation often requiring a certain amount of emotion work as various topics challenge privilege and power (Boler, 1999, 2004, 2013; Cutri & Whiting, 2015; Gorski, 2002, 2009a, 2009b, 2012; Whiting & Cutri, 2019; Zembylas, 2010).
While critical multicultural education courses for undergraduates are grounded in the work of individual instructors, one philosophy often employed is a pedagogy of discomfort (Boler, 2004, 2013; Cutri & Whiting, 2015; Whiting & Cutri, 2019). In this approach, teacher educators must also assume an ethic of discomfort or a responsibility to challenge or disrupt students’ hegemonic worldviews while also guiding them through the resultant discomfort (Cutri & Whiting, 2015; Whiting & Cutri, 2019; Zembylas, 2010, 2015; Zembylas & McGlynn, 2012; Zembylas & Papamichael, 2017). However, this deliberate decision to use discomfort as a tool to unpack social inequality is not without its drawbacks. Employing a pedagogy of discomfort can often result in personal attacks from students, is based in vulnerability, and can be risky for pre-tenured teacher educators to employ (Boler, 2013; Cutri, Whiting, & Bybee, 2020; Cutri & Whiting, 2015; Rice et al., 2015; Whiting & Cutri, 2019).

Critical multicultural education courses call on a pedagogy of discomfort to invite students into emotion work rethinking and (un)learning a way of being in the world (Whiting & Cutri, 2019). Critical multicultural educators have suggested a variety of strategies for encountering and mitigating student resistance including small class sizes, clear expectations for discussions, confidentiality, respect for all persons, hands-on assignments, and incorporating individuals who have effectively produced change (Tatum, 1992). While not often explicitly discussed, underlying each of these strategies is a sense of compassion and empathy in a desire to guide the student through discomfort (Zembylas & Papamichael, 2017). Boler (2004) goes so far to argue that this requires educators to understand the level of emotion work that is being demanded of students and provide what she calls a “critical hope.” She explains,

If I am asking students in some sense to annihilate the self as they have known it, I must also be able to meet their discomfort with compassion—and with resources to help them
replace the lost sense of self. Most importantly… critical hope requires a clear explication of what is lost and what might be gained through this suffering of a loss. If a pedagogy of discomfort takes away someone’s worldview, in compassion it needs to replace the vacuum with something else. (p. 129-130)

This suggestion—of answering emotions such as anger, shame, embarrassment, or frustration with the emotion of compassion—explicitly demonstrates the critical role of emotion as mediating social change and learning in these complex emotional contexts.

As discussed earlier, relegating emotions to a feminine realm has constructed them as a nuisance, something to be ignored or controlled, and the antithesis of rational thought and unhelpful in learning settings (Boler, 1999). However, explicit attention to emotion and feelings of discomfort, anger, frustration, or despair can operate as an entry point to explore and change the unequal distribution of societal power (Boler, 1999, 2004; hooks, 2014). The juxtaposition of these two statements is meant to show how emotions operate as a site for social control. The hegemonic, naturalized narratives surrounding emotions serve to maintain unequal power relations between groups. Explicitly attending to emotion can serve as a catalyst to begin to undo unequal power relations. Consequently, those interested in maintaining power dynamics in the status quo become heavily invested in the invisibility and silencing of emotions (Boler, 1999).

**Emotions in the Online Classroom**

Emotions as critical to opening dialogue for social justice become further complicated by the increasing pressure to create learning spaces in online settings. Generally, asynchronous courses where students access video lectures and work at their own pace through course content have gradually increased since the 1990s in a variety of educational contexts. These contexts include higher education, vocational schools, and job training. However, while online learning
has generally been used for adult learners in higher education, vocational, or job training, findings across educational contexts are similar; students experience psychological and communication gaps in online classrooms (Benton et al., 2014; Moore, 1997; Pan & Sullivan, 2005). Often, these gaps are the result of instructors and students being separated by time and space, being relatively unknown to each other, and being required to communicate through technology (Moore, 1973, 1989; Spitzer, 2001; Stein et al., 2005). The term, “transactional distance” is one way to consider how these psychological and communication gaps created by distance often create “special patterns of learner and teacher behaviors… that profoundly affect both teaching and learning” in online courses (Moore, 1997, p. 22).

In the past 40 years, online courses have attempted to bridge this transactional gap through increased student dialogue using online chat boxes, asynchronous digital dialogues, and blog postings with some success (Benton et al., 2014; Dammers, 2009; Falloon, 2011; Hutti, 2007; Moore, 1997; Pan & Sullivan, 2005; Spitzer, 2001; Stein et al., 2005). While Moore (1997) focused specifically on dialogue, or the constructive, purposeful, and respectful interactions between students in asynchronous classes to bridge transactional distance, this study will use the broader lens of interaction as it encompasses increased and decreased feelings of transactional distance.

**Online: Social Infrastructures**

The social organization of online synchronous classrooms encompasses the ways in which objectives, activities, and interactions are responsive and adaptable to individuals (Moore, 1997; Stein et al., 2009; Vandergrift, 2002). For example, a class of 400 students participating by video is designed to be a one-way presentation with little audience interaction, low levels of flexibility and a set schedule. The instructor is not easily able to differentiate content or adjust
the speed of the course if three or four students are struggling to succeed academically. This example would constitute a low level of social organization. In contrast, a course of 20 students participating by video more easily allows numerous student interactions to occur as questions may be posed multiple times throughout a 60-minute period. Additionally, the coursework may be adapted to the individual interests of students or taught at a slower pace to accommodate all learners. However, social organization as defined by these scholars largely referred to asynchronous learning.

While useful to look at learning in asynchronous organizational forms, there are issues that arise when exploring the dynamics of synchronous online learning spaces that take this even further as students interact in these spaces in real time. This thesis seeks to expand the idea of online social organizations using the term infrastructure (Vandergrift, 2002). Online infrastructures denote not only the social organization of the class and how adaptable the objectives and interactions are to the individual, but also capture distinctly synchronous online features such as the chat box, unmute/mute button, camera visibility, class size, and physical location of each participant.

The infrastructure of online classrooms suggest that smaller synchronous online courses may have greater adaptability to student needs because of their in-real-time interactions and fewer students. Students participating by video may unmute themselves and provide a wider range of responses to instructor questions, can receive clarification quickly, and indicate any confusion they may be experiencing. However, these opportunities for high level social interaction depend on how the instructor conceptualizes and organizes the course. In 1997, Moore warned of over-structured synchronous classes that resemble “one-way media presentations” where constructive, consistent student interaction is low and transactional distance
is high (p. 27). This same advice continues to be echoed and confirmed in more recent literature (Bolliger & Halupa, 2018; Huang et al., 2016; Ilagan, 2020; Lemak et al., 2005; Murphy & Rodriguez, 2008; Stein et al., 2005).

In both large and small classrooms, the level of social infrastructure depends on the nature of the course in addition to the “philosophy and emotional characteristics of teachers, the personalities and other characteristics of learners, and the constraints imposed by educational institutions” (Moore, 1997, p. 26). This assertion that emotional characteristics influence the learning experiences of online spaces has been confirmed in subsequent research. Additionally, online researchers further suggest that students who frequently experience frustration in online classrooms continue to articulate increased transactional distance from peers and/or their instructor regardless of the instructional technique (Benson & Samarawickrema, 2009; Brooks & Young, 2015; Chundur & Prakash, 2009; Falloon, 2011; Hara, 2010; Hrastinski, 2008; McBrien et al., 2009; Pan & Sullivan, 2005; Ustati & Hassan, 2013).

**Online: Classroom Interactions**

In online courses, student interactions are often facilitated by using online discussion boards where students do not need to be on the discussion platform at the same time. Hrastinski (2008) observed discussion boards facilitated thoughtful student reflection and demonstrated increased cognitive engagement, decreasing the transactional gap. Discussion boards also facilitated opportunities for students to listen to their peers and thoughtfully respond when differences of opinions occurred (Stein et al., 2009). However, students participating in asynchronous discussion boards were also more likely to feel disconnected from their peers and less likely to view themselves as part of a learning community compared to their in-person peers (Hrastinksi, 2008; Swan et al., 2000; Watts, 2016; Wegerif, 1998).
Synchronous learning or attending class through a video conferencing platform has become more frequent with multiple benefits for student interaction (Giesbers et al., 2014; McBrien et al., 2009). Video streaming synchronously into an online classroom at a specific time and day provide opportunities for instantaneous feedback and the ability to see classmates and instructors in real time. Students in online synchronous classrooms often report feeling more focused and willing to interact with their classmates as compared to asynchronous class spaces (Falloon, 2011; Hrastinski, 2008; Stein et al., 2005). Additionally, the ability for students to see peers react to another’s comments is often perceived as an advantage during classroom discussions compared to asynchronous discussion boards (Hrastinski, 2008). Finally, synchronous online courses can provide an increased sense of social connection through visual cues, facial expressions, and tone of voice resulting in a decreased perception of transactional distance (Falloon, 2011; Hrastinski, 2008; Watts, 2016). Thus, while both asynchronous and synchronous contexts provide opportunities for decreased transactional distance between students, more often a blend between the two types has proven most effective (Watts, 2016).

**Emotions in the Online Critical Multicultural Education Classroom**

As demonstrated above, emotions have historically been systematically silenced and relegated as inferior within patriarchal cultures (Boler, 1999). The rise of feminist theory and specifically, Black feminism have challenged these narratives repositioning emotions as critical forms of knowledge that act as entry points to explore unequal distributions of power within society (Boler, 1999; Butler, 1990; Collins, 2003; Doharty, 2020; hooks, 1989; Nash, 2013). However, emotions are also used as forms of resistance to learn within critical multicultural education courses and present considerable challenges to student engagement for online instructors (Benson & Samarawickrema, 2009; Brooks & Young, 2015; Chundur & Prakash,
Therefore, the emotions contextualizing teaching and learning critical multicultural education in an online classroom are nuanced, complex, and rarely studied. This project seeks to fill this gap by looking closely at emotional expressions in synchronous critical multicultural online classrooms through a microethnographic study.
CHAPTER 3

Methods

I employed a microethnographic approach (Denzin, 1994; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995) to explore the question of what types of classroom infrastructures and interactions characterize the emotional geography of an online, synchronous multicultural education course for undergraduate pre-service teachers. Microethnographies offer a nuanced and detailed approach to exploring emotions in educational settings and are particularly appropriate for exploring the nuanced verbal and physical exchange of emotion in classrooms. Microethnographies focus on a specific slice of everyday life, such as student interactions in a classroom (Stokrocki, 1997). Because emotions are performed in everyday practices, a microethnographic approach is best suited to explore the complexities of emotional geographies (see Zembylas, 2007). Furthermore, this approach has the potential to capture a complex variety of emotional performances in addition to looking at how emotions are embedded in politically sanctioned norms, obligations, and relations (Thoits, 2004; Zembylas, 2005b, 2007). Finally, this study also lends itself to a microethnographic approach as video recordings are used as a main source of data (Garcez, 1997; Streeck & Mehus, 2005).

Analyzing a slice of everyday life through a microethnographic approach requires investigating the phenomena within a specific case (Smith, 1978; Stake, 1995). Stake (1995) defined the characteristics of case study methodology as inherently holistic, empirical, interpretive, and emphatic. The study of emotional geographies lends itself to the holistic aspect of case research as it attends to the phenomenon (student interaction) and its structural components in their contexts. Additionally, case study methodology requires a constructivist epistemology which is congruent with the framing of emotions as interactionally exchanged and
performative (Stake, 1995; Yazan, 2015; Zembylas, 2007). However, while case study research may be flexible in design, a case must be bound within specific parameters and focused on a particular situation, event, program, or phenomenon (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995). For this study, the case is conceived as the two online critical multicultural education courses offered over a 7-week academic period at the university level. It is bound by the synchronous interactions between students during class time over the course of the academic period. Additionally, case studies require specific research questions and should include multiple data sources to capture the complexity of the case and an analysis of the data should encompass multiple passes at the data (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995). This was accomplished through multiple class observations over the length of a term semester, instructor interviews, and a short student questionnaire at the conclusion of the course referencing how each participate and present themselves across the whole platform.

Because of the personal and emotional engagement required of the participants and researchers in a microethnography (Smith, 1978; Streeck & Mehus, 2005; Thorne, 1993), I here disclose my own positionality. I am a 24-year-old, White, heterosexual, female. I attended public K-12 schools within a homogenous White, Christian, middle to upper-middle-class context. During my undergraduate degree, I acted as a teacher’s assistant in critical multicultural education courses for two different teacher educators and became familiar with the content and emotional nature of the course. It was here that I came to this topic of research during my undergraduate degree as an inquiry into how my own emotional experiences in the classroom impacted my learning as a preservice teacher (Finlayson et al., 2021). After graduating with my undergraduate degree, I began a master’s program while in my first and second year of teaching at a Title I high school in an online, hybrid format due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
Project procedures have been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board for working with Human Subjects (IRB) at the University and by the University’s College of Education (see Appendix A). Informed consent was obtained from the course instructor in addition to all undergraduate students enrolled in the courses. All data were anonymized and were not available to anyone directly involved in the class except at the aggregate level. Finally, steps were taken to allow for the ongoing nature of consent and confidentiality as all student names and identifiable information was blinded and all data and interviews were in secured files (Kustatscher, 2014, 2015).

Case Context

The university in this study is in the Mountain West region of the United States. As a private Christian institution, the university emphasizes the development of the holistic student and places an emphasis on academic, moral, and spiritual growth. For students, this often translates to open discussion regarding religious sentiment, an emphasis on service-based learning, and rigorous academic achievement. At times, the university is also home to a diverse range of viewpoints, specifically as it comes to matters of politics and social justice. This project explores two courses in multicultural education during one academic term including one class intended for early childhood and elementary education majors and another for content-specific secondary education majors.

At this university, elementary education undergraduates generally complete their coursework within four to five years and are scheduled to complete a required multicultural education course for licensure during the Winter semester of their sophomore year. In contrast, secondary content education majors remain in their content area colleges while intermittently taking courses within the college of education. Additionally, multicultural education courses for
secondary content education majors can be taken at any point during their major coursework. Because of this structure, secondary content education majors are less likely to know their peers across content areas, or in the course, and rarely interact with multicultural teacher educators outside of individual classes. These two classes of multicultural education, for elementary and secondary teaching majors, present an interesting case for analyzing the emotional exchanges and interactions of students who identify as pre-service educators as they navigate a highly emotional course (Gorski, 2002, 2006, 2009a, 2009b).

Participants

Participants in this study were drawn from two critical multicultural education courses being taught over Zoom for pre-service early childhood, elementary, and secondary educators. These pre-service educators were grouped by the college/university into two separate courses but with matching learning outcomes: one course for early childhood (grades PreK-3) and elementary (grades K-6) pre-service educators and another course for pre-service secondary educators (grades 6-12). Most of the early childhood, elementary, and secondary pre-service educators at this university fall within the norms of teacher candidates across the U.S (White, female, cisgender, heterosexual) and have a common religious background (Brookhart & Freeman, 1992; Case & Hemmings, 2005; Lowenstein, 2009). At the time of this study, most university students at this university had taken an average of two and a half semesters of online instruction prior to this course due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

All students were emailed a document explaining the nature of the study prior to the second Zoom class session. At the beginning of the semester, I joined each of the two classes via Zoom, explained the study, answered questions, and distributed the consent form. Out of the 29 pre-service teachers approached for this study, one pre-service elementary and one pre-service
secondary teacher declined to participate. The actions and participation of those students were not considered or analyzed in this project. All pre-service educators mentioned in the data below have been given pseudonyms and all identifiable information has been blinded. The two instructors of this course gave consent and were compensated with a $50 gift card for their time and effort, as well as a summary of key findings.

Participants: Early Childhood and Elementary Multicultural Course

Eighteen pre-service early childhood and elementary (EC/E) educators completed this course over the 7-week period. Of the 18, 12 students identified themselves as elementary education majors (K-8) and three preservice educators identified themselves as early childhood education (PreK-3) majors, with three choosing not to disclose their specific major. All 18 participants identified as cisgender females with 14 of the 18 identifying as White, one student identifying as Hispanic, one as biracial, and two as Pacific Islander. All students ranged between the ages of 19-25 years old. Finally, as is relevant to this study, five students were married and living with their partner, three students were residing within a parent’s home and ten students lived in off-campus housing with roommates.

The elementary course was taught by a White, female adjunct instructor, who will be referred to as Elaine. She has taught critical multicultural education for secondary education majors in-person on a semi-regular basis for the last 11 years and works as a coordinator for a teaching language minor that covers some overlapping content. She is semi-autonomous in how she teaches the course, using materials and learning outcomes created by the full-time teacher educators responsible for the course. Prior to this semester, Elaine had taught this specific course once online due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Prior to her current role, Elaine completed a master’s degree over a decade ago in teacher education while teaching at a secondary level.
**Participants: Secondary Education Multicultural Course**

The secondary multicultural course consisted of 15 pre-service secondary educators. Twelve identified as cisgender females with the three identifying as cisgender males. Some students in this specific classroom were one semester away from graduating with others in the second semester of their freshman year. A variety of secondary education majors were represented including art, dance, English, family and consumer science, music, social science, Spanish, German, physics, and technology and engineering education.

The secondary multicultural education is an adjunct instructor teaching critical multicultural education to undergraduates for the first time. She identifies as an Asian-American woman and will be referred to as Gabrielle. She is also semi-autonomous in how she teaches the course, using the same materials and learning outcomes prepared for the first instructor and in consultation with the full-time professors who are responsible for this class. Gabrielle also taught English at the middle school level for several years before leaving full-time teaching work. She recently completed her master's degree in teacher education at this university.

**Data Collection and Procedures**

Data for this microethnography was collected via video recordings of synchronous classes over the whole term. In addition, students were surveyed at the end of the term and 30-minute interviews were conducted with each of the instructors. All student participants were informed of the video recording and gave their consent. The following procedures were used to collect video data.

1. Each synchronous class was recorded in a gallery view so all students could be seen at the same time. This included when an individual shared their screen or did not have
their camera on. However, this did not include the times students entered breakout rooms.

2. Chat messages were also saved when individuals sent them publicly. While Zoom does have the capability to message people directly or privately, both instructors chose to remove the private chat feature. Therefore, this study only has access to the comments made in the public chat messages.

3. After each class period, video data were automatically transcribed. Both the video, public chat messages, and the transcript were automatically uploaded to the instructor's Zoom profile. Here, I accessed the videos with consent from instructors and uploaded them to a personal, private folder before conducting any coding.

For this project, five 3-hour sessions from each class were selected for in depth coding in order to dig deeply into the interactions of students and instructors. These 10 sessions represent 30 hours of video across the term with sessions at the beginning, middle and end of the course.

At the conclusion of the course, both instructors were interviewed regarding their perception of student interaction, participation, and visibility. Students were also given a small questionnaire at the end of their class that allowed them to indicate their race, gender, teaching major, and their perception of their own interactions, participation, and visibility. All data files were kept in a private and securely protected drive.

Data Analysis

Prior to coding, an initial analysis of the data was conducted using MAXQDA looking at all analyzed class context. I noted the number of times per class period a camera was turned off, the number of verbal chats sent, the use of a Zoom digital background, and any identifiable
background features for all individuals. In addition, all segments of code where participation (or the lack thereof) was identified and marked for closer coding in future passes through the data.

The initial pass through the data was used to see general patterns and identify basic descriptive codes that signified types of interactions. A priori coding was then used to identify any student interactions in the video data that could be coded as emotional performances, emotion gifts, and for how students are positioning themselves in class, or examples of the influence of the Zoom infrastructure (see Appendix B). Any interactions that did not fall within the above mentioned a priori codes were noted and a third pass at the data was then conducted to code using an open, inductive, emergent approach to find patterns that could inform the research questions (Strauss, 1987). This third round of coding was used to look for emergent themes and how specific categories of interaction may have been informed by the infrastructure, interactions, or political (power) frames of the online classrooms. Finally, student surveys and instructor interviews were analyzed looking for similar themes that had emerged during coding and for greater contextualization of the types and characteristics of online interactions and infrastructures within the Zoom emotional geography.
CHAPTER 4

Findings

I begin this section by noting the value of a microethnographic study when looking for nuances of student interactions and engagement within a video context. These findings, discussed below, were seen when looking specifically for types of student engagement and recognized only after multiple passes at the data, instructor interviews, and student surveys. Therefore, I do not expect any instructor, whether highly experienced in online teaching or otherwise, to be able to deduce or observe these findings in real time. However, by stepping back and considering the dynamics of the emotional geography of online multicultural education courses, these findings may prove useful to those teaching in online contexts; especially when viewed as ways to proactively structure classroom interactions rather than expecting to be able to correct or shape behaviors as they are occurring. The purpose of these findings is not to increase the workload for instructors but to provide observations and suggestions that are helpful for structuring online environments to increase student engagement, and as a result, lessen the emotional labor and fatigue for instructors and their students.

The principal finding of this study is that the emotional geographies of online, synchronous classrooms are characterized by the duality of space and place as shown in Figure 1. By design, instructors and students remain in an embodied, physical, place while interacting with others in an online space. Each student is in their own physical place while also interacting in an online space. Occupying a physical place while interacting in an online space impacted the types of emotional interactions that were available to students and teachers and their associated feelings of transactional distance represented by the relative closeness or distance between the students in Figure 1. Additionally, the place/space duality was also implicated as physical
environments were interrupted by indicating a sense of physical permeability to the classroom. Additionally, gendered norms of interaction emerged as gendered social frames emerged in the online classroom. In the sections below I will refer to Figure 1 to demonstrate the duality of place and space as it became relevant to the emotional geography of the online classroom.

**Figure 1**

*The Emotional Geography of These Online Classrooms*
Emotional Boundaries of Zoom Geographies

The boundaries of the Zoom classroom were distinct in many ways. External distractions such as spouses, roommates, pets, and technology frequently emerged creating a sense of permeability reflected in the dashed or dotted lines in Figure 1. Additionally, the presence of cell phones, technology, technical issues, cameras, and the mute button all contributed to increased feelings of transactional distance as students and instructors had to interact in separate physical places through the Zoom space. This is also reflected in Figure 1 as each student is in a different physical place but forced to interact through the online Zoom space to communicate with others. Permeable external boundaries and rigid internal boundaries were a part of the Zoom infrastructure mediating the emotional experiences and transactional distance between instructors and students. The following sections will discuss each of these findings in further detail.

External Permeability

The permeability of the Zoom classroom proved to be more difficult and at times more visible for instructors than students. This was largely because both instructors were rarely ever muted and almost never had enough time to manage their surroundings or choose when to unmute or turn off their cameras. Both Gabrielle and Elaine had moments where their personal lives inserted themselves into class, but in very different ways. Elaine primarily Zoomed from her university office, which allowed her to manage the permeability of Zoom more efficiently as compared to Gabrielle. For example, nearing the end of one class, Elaine received a phone call from her son’s school which she chose to pause class to answer. After completing the call, she continued to answer student questions while also remarking in the chat saying, “Sorry I was on the phone! I had an emergency call from my son’s teacher…I panicked and answered during class! He’s alive, all is fine…or will be!” While Elaine did not make this a verbal part of her
class and could have chosen not to give her students a reason why she took a phone call, the essential permeability of Zoom allowed Elaine the choice to interrupt the class. This was one of the only times in this video data where Elaine actively acknowledges the potential permeability of her own surroundings during a class period.

In contrast, Gabrielle always Zoomed from a private office in her home which may have led to a greater sense of permeability for her. During one class discussion, a knock came from her door and two small voices started to talk to her. While Gabrielle fumbled for the mute button, she eventually gave up searching for it and told her children to “go get grandma” and to “please leave the room.” After repeated attempts, the two voices left, and Gabrielle looked visibly flustered. She then paused before saying, “Just remember the other things you like about me. Just wait until you have kids, you cannot control them. They will just open the door... Let me lock the door.” In this instance, Gabrielle had to physically get up and lock the door to manage the permeability of her environment during a Zoom class and prevent what she perceived to be a problematic disruption. Gabrielle’s children interrupted class one other time where she again responded in an almost identical fashion. More of this experience will be expounded in a later section on gender frames and motherhood.

In each of these moments above, instructors worked to manage the permeability of synchronous classrooms in very different ways. For Gabrielle, this included locking a door, procuring childcare, and ensuring that she would not be physically disrupted. While Elaine taught from her private office at the university creating a stronger physical boundary within which to participate and teach her class, she too was interrupted at times by competing demands. In both cases, instructors intentionally worked to mitigate the permeability of the Zoom infrastructure in order to teach their class.
In contrast, many students attended class without intentionally creating clear boundaries to the permeability of Zoom, or they struggled to find a way to do this throughout the semester. This increased permeability and lack of boundaries to the physical environment was articulated by several students in the survey as they commented that their environment, either helped them to try and focus more, or it gave them an excuse not to focus. This idea was explicitly expressed by one student who said,

I came to the library for every class period so that I could be in a quiet place where I could hear what was going on and not be distracted by roommates, others, etc. It definitely benefited my learning and participation in class.

Students who created boundaries, or less-permeable environments from which to participate, directly benefited from not having to manage distractions and more often engaged directly in class videos. For example, students from both sections joined classes from a variety of places including bedrooms, the campus library, a food court, communal living spaces, and when taking a break from summer jobs. While many places were quiet and students were alone, others participated from public spaces where interaction with others disrupting their engagement was a frequent occurrence.

These spaces were interesting to observe from a microethnographic perspective as a student’s spouse, roommate, friend, or pet would emerge in the background of a student’s camera and often interact with the student during a class discussion or presentation. Moments like these became tangible as student lips would start to move and their eyes would look off to the side or up. Occasionally, students would try to hide their talking by putting their hand over their mouth or moving their camera in a downward direction. At other times, their outside interaction was apparent to the instructor and their peers without any attempt to hide it like
Student A in Figure 1. This was exemplified by one student who picked up their computer to move around and then suddenly disappeared. When they reappeared on the Zoom screen, they were in the passenger seat of a car without headphones on. The instructor continued their lecture and the student appeared to be actively talking to the other people in the car. This continued for 20 minutes until they reached their destination, got out of the car, entered the home, and began to participate in class again. It was experiences like these that emphasized how students inhabited more or less permeable environments from which to participate.

Another example of the external permeability of Zoom that brought outside influences into class frequently occurred through pets. For example, as a dog came into view during a classroom discussion, another student in the classroom exclaimed through the chat, “is that your dog???” disrupting classroom conversation. This was not an isolated incident. In a separate moment, another student began playing with their cat by throwing a ball repeatedly until the cat got bored while a different student’s dog was standing on the couch behind her. In response to a question, the student unmuted herself and apologized saying, “sorry if you can’t hear me. My dog is trying to catch a fly in the blinds, and I can’t get him to go away.” In these three examples, the pets seemed to prove overall distracting not only to their owners, but to the other students in the classroom as seen in chat comments that would appear shortly after their visual appearance. However, in these examples transactional distance may have been minimized as the pets fostered a sense of connection that became a benefit in the permeability of the Zoom environment.

The permeability of Zoom classrooms was also promoted by the presence of phones and other external technology devices throughout the course of class meetings as represented by Student E in Figure 1. Use of phones during class often appeared to increase transactional distance on the part of both instructor and student. Over the course of the 10 total Zoom class
meetings, there was an average of 4.4 times per class period where over 50% of all students were not making eye contact with the camera or where a distinct phone glow was present across student faces. While not able to note every student at every time who was looking at a device, one student, referred to as Kirsten, frequently Zoomed from a shared bedroom space with headphones. As the semester progressed, she almost always had her camera on but frequently looked down near the bottom of her computer screen - so much so that instead of seeing her eyes, the computer camera caught more of her eyelids and lashes. This physical position was assumed for each of the class periods analyzed and did not change frequently. While unsure of why this was the perspective she chose to display through Zoom, it became apparent during one Zoom class when the back of her phone appeared in the class camera lens for half a second before disappearing again. It became apparent that this position allowed Kirsten to have a phone in front of her and look as if she was listening or taking notes. While this may not have distracted her classmates, it may have had an impact on her own participation and sense of transactional distance with others in the class. In fact, she only contributed a total of one comment over the course of the whole semester. In addition, Elaine directly commented about this student in her final interview indicating her sense of transactional distance, as someone she felt she didn’t know and “probably could not recognize in the hallway if she passed me” as she “didn’t participate or really comment in class.”

The presence of cell phones throughout Zoom classes also emerged through sound notifications that interrupted class. As many phones are connected to computers allowing notifications of messages and other distractions, this emerged as a major contributor to how phones and embedded apps impacted Zoom classroom infrastructures. From all analyzed data, a total of four phone notifications were heard while students were talking and twice when
instructors were talking. This is significant as phone notifications can only be heard when a student or instructor is unmuted – meaning that the four times a student’s phone was heard in the Zoom recording, that same student was actively participating in class by unmuting oneself. Thus, this finding does not indicate how many times an instructor or student was notified of a text message or other alerts while muted but would suggest that students may have been receiving notifications on their phones or computers at much higher rates. This was apparent as one student answered an incoming call during class. Holding her phone in her right hand, she moved the lens of the camera down to where the only thing visible was her chin to the bottom of the torso and the phone in her hand. At this point, she proceeded to talk to the person on the phone via speakerphone as her chin moved up and down. While the phone call only lasted for about 20 seconds, it demonstrates how students were sometimes available and often pulled in other directions during Zoom class. These interjections from their external environment created more permeable experiences, directly impacting participation through increased transactional distance.

While video data cannot confirm the reasons why students were interacting with their phones, there were multiple visual moments where students began to smile or laugh on camera without a prompt or explanation coming from the class discussion. As the private chat feature of Zoom was intentionally turned off by the instructors and thus unavailable for students to converse with each other, it can be assumed that there had to be some type of image, graphic, video, media, or text external to the class seen by the student on their private devices as they interacted in an additional separate online space reflected by Student E in Figure 1. Visual expressions of smiling or laughing often occurred at inopportune times such as when the class was discussing students living in homeless situations or other sensitive topics. However, students displaying this type of behavior often caught themselves quickly, before looking at the camera.
with a more serious face or nodding in agreement before returning to their device. In these instances, students moved to manage reactions in the context of understanding their behavior to be potentially disruptive or disrespectful to the guest speaker or the instructors. However, managing their reactions was a direct response to them including their cell phone in class and increasing the permeability of their online experience thereby increasing transactional distance between themselves and what was unfolding in the Zoom classroom.

Additionally, participation was also interrupted by technical issues often resulting in increased transactional distance as shown in Figure 1 by Student F. This occurred as students had computers die and had to transfer to a mobile device or Wi-Fi and/or videos freeze or cut out while talking. These technical issues or spaces that were loud or potential distracting seemed to be deflating to students. This was particularly challenging for one student as they consistently participated in class from the campus food court. While this student commented more than others throughout the term, almost all comments were difficult to understand, and they were asked more than once to repeat themself. For this student, this often appeared to be frustrating as the instructor or students seemed to merely skip over her comment because they did not want to ask the student to repeat their comment a third time or because they could not hear her the first time.

**Internal Rigidity**

As Zoom created an almost fluid or permeable boundary for external interruptions, it also seemed to create a more rigid internal boundary for student-student and student-teacher interactions. In this video enabled context, it is impossible to have a shared reference with each other as all are looking at cameras, and it is unclear what people are looking at and if anyone is looking at you or inviting a response with a look. This idea was exemplified by one student who commented that participating in a Zoom format “was not terrible. The hardest part is when two
people start speaking at once and you try to figure out who should talk.” Unsure of who wanted to make a comment and who was paying attention and following the conversation, Elaine went as far to create a popsicle stick cup where she could “randomly” call on students via popsicle stick to respond to a question. This idea is reflected in Figure 1 as students located in individual places are required to work through the Zoom space to connect or communicate with their peers or instructors directly.

Internal Zoom boundaries between students and instructors became widened through instructor comments to the entire class when they seemed to feel frustrated at a lack of participation or when feeling a large transactional distance. For example, Gabrielle used a form of pleading for students to unmute themselves when she said things like, “please comment out loud” and “somebody please unmute yourself.” Moments like these were also accompanied by commands such as, “just, everyone unmute yourself, let’s just talk like we would be if we were sitting in a classroom, unmuted.”

In Elaine’s private interview, she described the rigid internal boundaries of Zoom as being “so quiet” and how it was “weird not to hear the conversations students were having with one another... and that was something that Zoom took away from me.” Elaine went on to say that she would “never teach this class again online. Never again” because of the lack of discussion and interaction she could have with her students. Her expectations of interactions in the class were likely shaped from her long experience teaching the class in-person. Furthermore, Elaine suggested that the content of multicultural education — because it's emotional in nature — may be more difficult to teach online. In many ways, Elaine described the online class as a form of banking education where “students got the content,” but where she was unsure of their dispositional change. When asked how she as an educator felt about that, she suggested that it
was her own nature that made her doubt the dispositional changes of her students saying, “there are some instructors that aren’t touchy feely like me... so maybe Zoom would work for them.” Elaine’s statement is interesting as it reveals an assessment of the online infrastructure of Zoom to be non-emotional and non-relational.

For students, the rigid internal boundaries of Zoom were more nuanced. One student commented in the final survey that discussions in class were “hard to make feel as genuine as a real, in-person discussion, but [were] probably as good as they could be.” Of the times where there was an obvious question posed by instructors, student response time to questions normally ranged from 13 to 20 seconds. This length of time to wait for student responses was exemplified by one conversation between students in Elaine’s classroom. A student began to tell a story about when she was asked to attend a high school dance. As the story escalated, three other students came on and off mute to verbally contribute comments. Eventually, one student left themself unmuted as they laughed. While seemingly small, when originally coded the comment made about this particular video clip was that “there was no lag. The response time was like a real conversation compared to previous classes.” Perhaps it was the response time between individuals that contributed to making Zoom discussions “hard to make genuine.” In this sense, the infrastructure of the unmute button on Zoom may have contributed to an increased sense of transactional distance and produced more rigid internal boundaries between Zoom participants.

In contrast, active student participation in Zoom helped to bridge transactional distance. This was suggested in student comments from the final survey when asked who in their class they felt they would like to have in a breakout room with them when discussing sensitive topics. Student responses included comments like, “[This student] because she always participates and has insightful comments,” and “[this student] because she shared her opinions even if they
weren't the most popular,” or “[Student X], because she always spoke up, especially when no one else was saying anything.” For students, feeling comfortable, or a decrease in transactional distance with their peers was directly tied to their perception of a peer’s participation and sharing in class.

In the analyzed data, the elementary section had an average of 24.2 verbal comments per class period resulting in about one verbal student comment every 6.8 minutes with an average of 30.2 chat comments per class period. Gabrielle’s secondary content major section had an average of 37.2 verbal comments per class period resulting in about one student comment every 4.4 minutes with an average of 24.4 chat comments per class period. However, upon closer inspection, the verbal comments made for both the elementary and secondary class sections were consistently made by the same 4 to 5 students who monopolized over 50% of all verbal comments.

In addition to both chatting and unmuting/verbal comments, an interesting mode of trying to decrease transactional distance emerged as instructors asked students to give different types of physical feedback. This occurred as instructors asked students to give them “thumbs up” or to “nod their heads if they understood” or “raise your hands.” While not physically in-person, both instructors relied heavily on the visible student feedback they could see. For students, these physical feedback moments often had to be exaggerated if the instructor was to see it. For example, at one point Elaine asked students if they wanted a break to which 3 to 4 students nodded their heads slightly with one student giving a thumbs up. However, Elaine was unable to register the physical response to her question and responded saying, “all right! You called it. We are just going to continue to plow on through.” This type of reaction was also prevalent in Gabrielle’s class during discussions as students would physically raise their hand to make a
comment but be unseen or uncalled upon by Gabrielle until the student finally unmuted themselves and interjected. Using physical responses to decrease transactional distance was also used to register if students were present and paying attention to the instructor. This came in requests such as “nod your head if you’re following me” or asking students to “raise their hands if...” and ”give me a thumbs up if we’re good.” Each of these calls for physical responses were used to help the instructor receive feedback for whether they could proceed and if a student was actively listening or engaged in the content to decrease feelings of transactional distance in online settings.

Cameras also operated as a distinct and noticeable feature that may have contributed to the rigid internal boundaries of Zoom classrooms. For instructors, student cameras turning on and off generally increased feelings of increased transactional distance. While both instructors asked students to keep their cameras on, Elaine, who taught the elementary education section, had an average of 27 times per class period where a student turned off their camera for any length of time. This was similar to Gabrielle’s section of secondary content education students where student cameras went off an average of 19.8 times per class period. Both instructors specifically mentioned how difficult it was for them as teachers to not know why a student’s camera was off or if the student was present and focused on the class content. This sense of not knowing whether students were present and paying attention contributed to feelings of insecurity for Elaine as she mentioned to her TA, “I just don’t know if students [without their cameras on] are there and if they’re going to respond.” This feeling of insecurity was demonstrated as Gabrielle would call on a student without a camera on and would either get a delayed response or no response at all. After every one of these failed interactions, she would then turn to a student who was a frequent verbal participator and had their camera on to answer the question.
Student cameras coming on and off also generated increased transactional distance for instructors. Specifically, Elaine struggled with four students who insisted on keeping their cameras off even when she sent specific emails to them or private messages. Elaine described this dilemma as wanting to respect student decisions while also feeling a large sense of transactional distance. She described this transactional distance as “missing reactions and human connections” and that this semester had not come “full circle.” She described this as feeling unsure if her students’ “dispositions had changed, because [she] could not see their reactions or hear them.” For Elaine, the philosophy of the class was for students to “feel a sense of inclusion and [for her,] the best way to teach inclusion is to model it in our classrooms... and [she] just felt like there was a non-model component in this online stuff.” For Elaine, modeling a sense of inclusion and feeling a sense of security in her teaching was directly tied to students having their cameras on.

However, even when students always had their cameras on, they were not necessarily focused or attentive in the classroom discussion or space as modeled by Student C in Figure 1. This was demonstrated by one student who was always in class, but never made a comment via chat or by unmuting the computer. As Gabrielle always held a prayer at the beginning of her class sessions, she called on a student to pray and everyone with a camera on closed their eyes and bowed their heads except for one student. Instead, the student was closer to the camera than normal and appeared to be taking some form of notes or actively working on something. Based on this behavior, it appeared that they did not know that one of their classmates was praying. After the prayer was finished, their behavior remained almost identical for the next 20 to 30 minutes. It appeared as if this student had their camera on while having the volume muted on their computer. This conclusion became an even greater probability when Gabrielle sent students
into breakout rooms, and it took this student an extra ten seconds to put themselves into their room while appearing a bit flustered. Thus, while the permeability of Zoom was physically demonstrated by cameras coming on and off, students were able to leave the classroom discussion in a variety of ways even if it appeared as if they were present.

Exploring the transactional distance experienced by students because of the camera was more difficult using observational data. However, when asked how they thought Zoom impacted their participation or communication in class, one student specifically referenced the physical separation of persons as impacting her emotional experience as they described how “the Zoom format lacks a lot that in-person classes have. There's a lack of energy because everyone is so separated physically.” This student comment directly tied a physical component of feeling separated from classmates to a low energy emotional state – something that was not mentioned explicitly in any in-class student comments. However, this sentiment was echoed by Elaine when she asked students, “what do you think about online?” and then responded, “I would rather not. I shouldn't say this... but this class is so much more fun on campus.”

**Emotional Transactions**

Students in these two classes managed feelings of transactional distance as mediated by the infrastructure of Zoom by exchanging emotion within an affective economy. While some exchange of emotion came in the form of emotion work, or gifts, there were moments when students performed or did not perform emotions due to efforts to extend or lessen the distance between themselves and the instructor. Each of these emotional transactions worked within an affective economy where students and instructors were able to exchange emotion gifts for increased or decreased closeness with their peers or with the instructor. This will be explored in further detail in the sections below.
**Emotion Work**

At times, the chat box appeared to function for students as a place to perform emotion work or appear “nice.” While the chat was not used frequently in either class, chat comments did emerge as valuable for many students as it allowed them a chance to process how to phrase hard questions, comments, or concerns. In doing so, the option to put a question in the chat box rather than speaking it aloud created the opportunity to “polish” one’s thoughts. As one student commented in the final survey,

I'm a really shy person, so speaking up in general was something that was hard for me, especially in some of the more difficult topics we covered in the course. I am personally a fan of the chat because it allowed me to phrase my thoughts in a more polished way. I also didn't feel as much judgment when I shared thoughts in the chat.

The perception that this student might be misunderstood or “judged” for their questions or comments when expressing them verbally is interesting as it suggests that the chat box may lower feelings of anxiety or stress for students when discussing difficult topics such as race, Whiteness, gender, or sexuality. Therefore, the opportunity to put a comment in the group chat may facilitate emotion work for the student as they have additional space and time to attempt to put their thoughts into written words.

Outside of difficult topics of conversation, students could also use the chat to add hedging phrases such as “haha” or emoticons to comments or statements. These emotion phrases or emoticons seemed to operate as a form of niceness when a student wished to disagree with another’s comment. For example, during a race and Whiteness discussion, students specifically used question marks and “haha” phrases to deemphasize their opinion. In the conversation below, Vickie is one of three students in the classroom who identifies as a person of color.
Vickie: Alice, I’m still interested in the BOM videos because they specifically called for people of multicultural backgrounds for the videos so it’s interesting that they casted the darker skinned people for the “bad guys”

Alice: Definitely! I’ll look around and see if I can dig up the post/article, he worded it way better than I could haha

Tira: Yes if you find it please send it in the chat!

Ava: I had some friends who were in the BOM videos and they got the roles because they are people of color but they were just part of the families of the “good guys” and had great experiences on set. I guess it is different for everyone…?

Vickie: Yeah, same.

Vickie: I mean the Lamanites were darker in complexion as said in the Book of Mormon so maybe that’s why so it would be more “accurate” but idk hahah it’s interesting for sure

As a student of color, Vickie brings up how they see an element of racism in a shared group of videos many of these students have watched. Ava, who is White, suggests that she has friends of color with different experiences who do not identify elements of racism and that perhaps because her friends of color find no racism present, there is no racism, thereby potentially discounting Student 1’s comment. However, Ava then employs a question mark implying that she or they (her friends) could be wrong and that her comment may not be absolute. This hedging or emotional performance of niceness is then followed by Vickie who reaffirms the videos as historically accurate but still racist while mimicking Ava’s niceness with a “hahah” and an abbreviated “I don’t know” to lighten the disagreement. In this sense, the chat box and texting language allowed students to make sure they were still perceived as conforming to “niceness” norms while disagreeing with one another.
Managing one’s emotional work emerged in Zoom as students also had the opportunity to remove themselves from classroom conversations within the space to process their emotions and perform the emotion work necessary to rejoin the conversation in helpful ways. An example of this occurred during the class period Elaine set aside to discuss gender and sexuality. To begin the class, Elaine had invited in a few LGBTQIA+ community members to discuss their experiences in public schools and how to create safer classroom environments for all students. After they were introduced, a student who will be referred to as Lisa, typed the following through the chat to the class, “So excited for the discussion today! I wore my ally necklace for the occasion! :)” As the panel began to explore topics of conversation, Lisa took a screenshot of herself at her desk and placed it as her Zoom background and left. Upon closer inspection of this moment, Lisa may have been ruffled by a comment made by one panel member based on a furrowed brow and her mouth having popped open just prior to her placing the screenshot. Lisa’s screenshot then remained on for the remainder of the panel.

Lisa’s behavior was curious as she had proclaimed herself to be a LGBTQIA+ ally in the chat but appeared to be removing herself from engagement in the conversation. After the panel members left, Elaine led a brief discussion attempting to debrief the topic. It was then that Lisa removed the picture of herself as a screenshot in her background and said,

Yeah, I really appreciated the comment they made about um, not using the phrase, love the sinner, hate the sin. It's not the first time I've heard that, cause, I've talked about it before, I've listened to these podcasts [that say the phrase]. And they mention that, and it's the first time I've heard [to not use that phrase] and it was... it really stung at first, cause it was like, oh, like I had heard that before and I had felt like that was okay and then I realized, no, that really hurts people's feelings which makes total sense if you think
about it. But I will admit that it really stung at first and I was like, kind of struck, like, what am I supposed to think? So, it kind of took some time for me to mull it over and think about what that meant.

Lisa’s description of the events offered the perspective that the panel was a difficult conversation for her to listen to and understand. She was engaging in discomforting pedagogy that mapped on to the goals of the class for dispositional change. For Lisa, instead of turning off her camera, leaving a black square with her name, she chose to put a screenshot of herself perhaps to symbolize her wanting to be able to listen and honor the experiences of the panel members, but feeling unable to be fully present in her current state. In this sense, Zoom provided an opportunity for Lisa to perform productive emotion work by pulling back to “mull over” difficult information and then returning to the conversation when she was prepared to constructively engage. Putting herself as a Zoom background helped her to manage the emotion work to reflect and consider her dispositional commitments and learn how to better honor the experiences of the panel members. This action may also be seen as a form of emotion gift giving to the panel members as it signified her willingness to listen and honor their experiences while personally grappling with her own bias or prejudice. While this type of behavior was only clearly demonstrated once in this data, there may have been other times that were less visible as students employed a similar strategy to perform emotion work, withdrawing to consider before reentering the Zoom classroom.

Finally, student emotion work was also facilitated by instructors using ideological support. As most students in this classroom identified with the same religious faith, instructors frequently used quotes, phrases, or videos from members within the church community that emphasized social justice and equity within education. For example, when discussing racial
prejudice and discrimination, Gabrielle specifically used a Black member of this specific Christian church to demonstrate the use of microaggressions and the systemic exclusion of Black people from positions of power. As this could have been a sensitive topic for some students, before showing the film Gabrielle stated, “she's a member of The Church, if that helps you [feel better about it].” Using the work of people who were active participants of the same practicing faith was an attempt to use ideological support to manage and promote open-mindedness in students toward the content. In the above example, the instructor was suggesting to students that it is okay to acknowledge the history of White supremacy within this church because it was said and discussed by members of the same faith.

However, Gabrielle also frequently used examples from the shared church community to demonstrate difficult concepts or give examples of oppression, discrimination, or other exclusionary topics. For example, when asked to give an example of systemic oppression Gabrielle utilized a common controversial topic:

We tend not to talk about oppression in The Church, but if you were to take it from an outsider perspective... you could see how someone would think that the church is an oppressive institution with regard to women. The rights that women have; the leadership positions women are allowed to hold; the number of women who speak in general [gatherings]. You could see how someone who is not a member of the church could see this as oppressive at an institutional level.

Using the church as a concrete example of institutionalized oppression could have been difficult for students to manage emotionally. Especially if they feel a deep sense of identity connection to the institution of the church and its policies. The data do not show specific student responses emotionally in this specific class, but this framing worked to anticipate emotional responses and
shape the emotional norms for the discussion. In both ways, Gabrielle utilized a common faith-based institution to invite students to perform emotion work and to recognize oppression in the institutions they were currently interacting within.

**Emotion Gifts**

Emotion gifts are rarely performed and therefore valuable lenses into how they may promote feelings of closeness and decrease transactional distance. Within Zoom classrooms, emotion gifts occurred when instructors sought genuine feedback or noticed and inquired into the personal lives of their students. Additionally, students gave emotion gifts in the form of smiles, verbal responses such as laughter, and increased participation.

Elaine was particularly adept at giving emotion gifts to her students. Small moments of attending to the personal lives of students seemed to promote a sense of closeness as students would almost immediately unmute themselves and chat with the instructor. For example, Elaine noticed when one student had cut their hair and proceeded to ask that student how it felt. The student responded and the conversation continued for almost 30 seconds between the student and instructor. Similarly, at the beginning of a different class period, Elaine began by asking a student about a church volunteer opportunity and how she liked it. This small inquiry into what Elaine did know about her students served as emotion gift giving as one-on-one conversations were otherwise nonexistent in the main room of Zoom. These moments decreased transactional distance and Elaine used them to foster connection in the emotional geography.

As mentioned earlier, both instructors articulated feeling a sense of missing human connection and lack of closeness with their students in this format. However, the instructors perceived themselves to have closer relationships with students who commented aloud over those who did not. During the instructor interview, Elaine specifically noted “that students who
commented via unmuting themselves were the ones she felt [she] knew best.” She perceived herself to have smaller transactional distance with students who commented on a more regular basis. While this may not have been an intentional decision-making process on the part of the students, those who chose to unmute themselves and talked at a greater rate were given the emotion gift of being perceived as emotionally closer to the instructor who occupied a position of power within the Zoom geography.

Students additionally gave emotion gifts through smiles and laughter. As most student expressions were blank faces as they looked at the video screen, there were moments on camera where after an instructor shared something or made a joke, students would physically smile or laugh. For example, at one point when students were in breakout rooms, Elaine received a phone call from her child’s school. As students came back from their discussions, she exclaimed, “oh man, I just got a phone call from the school... I guess my kid is being naughty at recess!” While no student was unmuted, several students smiled while two or three laughed at the exclamation. This was one simple way students interacted with the instructor in positive emotional expressions that may have helped decrease transactional distance and given the instructor an emotion gift.

**Feeling Rules and Performances**

Emotional performances as currency in the Zoom emotional geography were used to align oneself to the feeling rules of the classroom and decrease transactional distance. Specifically in this Zoom environment, feeling rules, as dictated by the instructor, served to indicate emotional performances by students. For instance, Gabrielle frequently used phrases such as “doesn’t that just get your blood boiling?” or “it just makes me so angry.” In doing so, Gabrielle may have set up some of the feeling rules for participating in the class conversation
when certain topics arose. In another example, when it came to feelings rules about Critical Race Theory in the classroom and legal repercussions, Gabrielle first shared her feelings of frustration and disappointment as well as feeling “scared” setting up the feeling rules surrounding the discussion of the topic. After one student’s comment on Critical Race Theory, Gabrielle followed up their comment with the question, “is that scary to you? Is it scary that there could be an attempt to rewrite history?... This directly affects you all [as future educators].” By evoking their developing identities as teachers and asking specifically if this student was scared, Gabrielle was perhaps assuming her students felt the same way she felt about the national conversation or her emotion rule. In response to Gabrielle’s question, the student responded, “yes” after several seconds while three other students nodded. Gabrielle was establishing a feeling rule that students could take up through an emotional performance if they chose to do so.

However, not all students were keen to perform the formal feeling rules instructors created. For example, Gabrielle chose to share a story about a time when she experienced racial gaslighting. As Gabrielle relayed the climactic moment of racial prejudice, two students began to shake their head back and forth while another student visibly opened her mouth as if she were gasping. These students visually performed their emotion in such a way that Gabrielle could see a sense of disbelief or awe. While these students visually performed their emotions for their instructor to see, the remainder of the students remained staring at the camera.

Emotion performances and non-performances were also exemplified by the inclusion of one’s pronouns on their Zoom name. When the course began, one student, who we will call Mailie in Gabrielle’s secondary class, included their pronouns on their Zoom screen, with no students including their pronouns in the elementary education section. During the class period
designated for discussing gender and sexuality, the use of including pronouns was brought up as
Gabrielle chose to share what she wanted to change in her teaching practice.

**Gabrielle:** You know what, I want to tell you what mine is because I have been
struggling with this. I want to add my gender pronouns to my Zoom and I cannot figure
out how. [Mailie], how do you do it?

**Mailie:** Umm, there is a way to edit your name. You can rename yourself if you press the
little three dots on your picture and add your pronouns to it.

**Gabrielle:** Did it work?! It did?! *claps hands together* You guys, I’ve been going into
Zoom settings. I have it attached to my last name in Zoom settings. Like, I have been
going through this for three weeks now. Thank you! Does anyone else feel so inclined to
do the same?!

At that time, four students went on to add their gender pronouns to their Zoom profile name. By
talking about how she wanted to add her pronouns and how that is one way she could make a
more inclusive classroom environment, Gabrielle set up a feeling rule for students to be inclusive
and perform their inclusivity in that moment. If they chose to accept the feeling rule, they could
add their pronouns to their Zoom screen at that moment and align themselves with how the
instructor felt about the situation. Conversely, they could choose to not update their Zoom name
and be perceived as publicly displaying some form of hesitancy or resistance or discomfort or
another emotion with the idea. While we do not know how students felt about that invitation,
placing one’s pronouns on Zoom was a specific invitation from the instructor to perform an
inclusive act.
Gendered Frames in Zoom Classrooms

Gender specifically emerged as socially framed and connected to power, marital status, and motherhood as relevant frames to emotional boundaries and transactions emerged in both courses but in separate ways for instructors and students. For students, gender emerged as critical to framing their rate of interaction. This finding began to develop as the number of comments made by the men in Gabrielle’s classroom were significantly higher when compared to the women. For example, 32% of all comments made in the secondary classroom were made by men, while men composed 20% of the class. If ignoring the one male student who made no comments throughout the entire semester, two men (12.5% of the class) made up a disproportionate 32% of all verbal comments (see Appendix C).

Qualitatively, it appeared that men from Gabrielle’s class felt more comfortable unmuting themselves and speaking up without having to be called on. The following story demonstrates this assertion. During a discussion about critically considering the institutions they participate in, Gabrielle began to show the statistics for students admitted to the university and began asking a series of questions. As she began asking questions, one student named Katie attempted to answer the question.

Gabrielle: Who is doing the performing arts?... *Katie raises her hand.

Gabrielle: Who is getting 3.8, 4.0 GPA’s? *Katie raises her hand again.

Gabrielle: Who are those students? What kind of resources do they have? What type of families do they have? *Katie raises her hand and then slowly tucks her hair behind her ear before lowering her hand again.

Gabrielle: Do you think this is reflective of students across the world? Like I said, there are no right or wrong answers.
Three times, Katie attempted to raise her hand to make a comment or respond to the instructor’s question. However, following these three questions, Rick, one of the male students in the class unmuted himself to say:

**Rick:** Um, I kind of think it’s a reflection about [the intermountain west] where the schools are located. It costs money to come here. Even if the tuition is reduced and things like that, [out-of-state and international students] must live away from home and get visas. It can be expensive.

To Rick’s comment, Gabrielle went on to talk about whether the university was accepting students from a variety of countries, states, or backgrounds before posing the question: “do we accept equally from every country?” Once again, Katie raised her hand while Gabrielle concluded the discussion with “Thoughts to ponder! Thoughts to ponder, you guys.” To Gabrielle’s conclusion, Katie’s hand slowly came down and Gabrielle continued in her lecture. As discussed in previous sections, participation as perceived by the instructors helped them to feel as if they “knew those students better” than those who did not verbally participate. However, this fails to consider the social framing of women as non-assertive or less aggressive resulting in female students feeling less inclined to unmute and insert themselves into the conversation without being directly called upon. For Katie, raising her hand did not lead to contributing her voice and opinion. However, an hour later Gabrielle posed another question. This time, Katie’s hand came up as she simultaneously unmuted herself to answer the question. Because she inserted herself instead of waiting to be called on, she was able to share her thoughts with the class without being missed by the instructor. Women in Gabrielle’s classroom unmuted and inserted themselves less than the male students which reflects a gendered expectation and performance that is well documented (Karpowitz et al., 2012; Stoddard et al., 2020).
The dynamics reflecting gendered norms of participation in Elaine’s section of multicultural education were also disproportional. In the absence of any male students, four female students (roughly 22% of the class) from Elaine’s section constituted 51% of all verbal comments made during the semester (see Appendix C). This disproportionality was subtle to detect without directly marking the number of times students commented per class period. For example, during one class period, Elaine specifically remarked to her teaching assistant that the students, “were really commenting and participating today.” While unsure of how Elaine was defining participation, when broken down by comment, five students (27% of the class) had made 81% of the classroom comments for that day.

For female students, marital status also emerged as critical to framing the amount of emotion work required to participate in class. One example came as a student, Tira, who after raising her hand prefaced her comment with “this is kind of awkward because my husband is sitting right here” and proceeded to share a story about her husband that related to the content. For this student, having a perceived audience meant that she had to perform some emotion work to potentially manage two audiences, to share her story, and perhaps even needed to ask her husband prior to sharing if it was okay.

*Frames of Marriage*

While the presence of a spouse in the background may have been uncomfortable or awkward for students, there were several times where it also appeared to generate conflict between the student and their spouse. For example, Gabrielle frequently used an anonymous survey given to students at the end of class for them to indicate things they liked, what they would like to change, and how they were feeling about the topics. The next class period, Gabrielle would pick two or three comments to read aloud to the class and discuss. The class
period following Race, Whiteness, and White Supremacy, Gabrielle chose to share this anonymous comment made by a student:

I told my husband that I believed White privilege is real just now and his response shocked me. He said, ‘absolutely do not talk to me about that. Do not.’ But I immediately realized that I used to say the same thing. I feel like through humility I’ve really come a long way in expanding my outlook on this issue. Even if I don’t agree with everything, I feel like I can choose better how to respond.

This student’s comment about discussing White privilege with their husband and his definite response demonstrates how perhaps a student’s gendered framing of spouse may have come into conflict throughout the course of the semester.

Conflict between students and spouses was also made apparent in another example in a particularly animated moment between a student and her husband. In the final class period, Gabrielle chose to play a video highlighting how Church experiences and realities for Black people are different from White people, particularly when it comes to past restrictions on Black men in the faith. While the video only lasted about two minutes, the video feed of a student (Clara) became particularly interesting. As the video began, a man's arm clearly came into view as he was also watching the video. However, after the phrase, “sometimes members of the faith defend their history with ignorance,” the man stood up and began moving his hands up and down in an animated fashion. Immediately, Clara’s computer camera was shifted so the only thing visible was her chin to her mid torso. However, as her camera was still on, her hands and chin start to move animatedly as she responded to whatever the man has said. While not privy to the conversation between her and the man, there was an obvious emotional response to the video. Additionally, it also cannot be assumed whether the conversation was positive or negative, but it
does definitively suggest that students were managing gendered frames within complex relationships in real time as they were participating in a Zoom space from a variety of places. A comment in the student final survey supports this notion as there were moments for one student where “if my husband was present, he would usually make comments on what was being said that he disagreed with during class.”

Gender frames were also made relevant for instructors as their social framing as women and mothers emerged in Zoom classes. However, as this section will continue to describe the decisions of instructors on how to manage their gender and motherhood frames, I first acknowledge that professionality within Western culture has historically been categorized as masculine (Boler, 1999). Therefore, when frames of gender or motherhood emerge in professional spaces and activities, they are often subjected to greater consequences and judgements than their male counterparts.

*Frames of Motherhood*

Instructors based their gender framing first on where they chose to Zoom from and their environment – each element perhaps impacting students’ perceived sense of professionalism and by association, the transactional distance between the instructor and students. For Elaine, the presence of her university office connoted a sense of professionalism, while Gabrielle chose to Zoom from a private office in her home. Both instructors had few observable items to give students information about them in their background, although neither of them employed a Zoom filter to shield their background from view. Additionally, both instructors asked students to call them by their first names, as they did not hold doctorate degrees, which perhaps lessened the transactional distance and/or decreased a perceived sense of professionalism. Specifically, Elaine
also chose to give students her cell phone number and to “please text or call if you need something. I’m so happy to help.”

Instructor gender frames also became visible when Zoom sessions were interrupted by instructor family issues. As previously described, Gabrielle’s children came into her private office twice during class periods to request help or food. To this, Gabrielle’s sense of professionalism was brought in tension with her social framing as a mother. After both interactions, Gabrielle’s next comment to the class was, “just remember the things you like about me” implying that the presence of her children somehow lessened her legitimacy or ability to teach or how she was perceived by her students as being professional. For Gabrielle, managing her professionalism included locking a door, timing her children’s nap times to class times, and procuring childcare to not be disrupted while teaching. She was clearly distressed when these efforts did not hold these spaces as separate. The managing of framing self as a mother and a professional identity emerged in this case because the instructors were both actively working as mothers with children living at home.

The emotional geographies of synchronous, online classrooms are complex as the boundaries of the classroom are permeable and often difficult to control due to outside influences. Additionally, rigid internal boundaries often result in increased feelings of transactional distance and reduced participation. However, students and instructors were able to give and receive emotion work, gifts, and performances in ways that decreased transactional distance and promoted feelings of closeness. Finally, as verbal participation was one of the best ways to decrease transactional distance, attention must also be given to the ways in which gender, marital status, and motherhood impact the rates of participation and perception of professionality in the online classroom.
CHAPTER 5

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore the classroom infrastructures and interactions characterizing the emotional geography of two synchronous, online critical multicultural education classrooms. What emerged was a space characterized by permeability, online interactions suggesting an affective economy, and gendered framings of the body. Each of these findings stem from students and instructors simultaneously inhabiting and navigating the duality of physical place and online space and its subsequent transactional distance. The sections below will elaborate the implications of these findings in greater detail and connect them to existing literature.

Duality of Place, Space, and Bodies

Creating online spaces that serve to connect individuals and create communities of learning requires attending to the emotional experiences of instructors and students. Educational theory related to emotional geographies has served elementary and secondary educators in understanding how the infrastructure of K-12, public classrooms impact the emotional experiences of educators, students, parents, and other stakeholders (Hargreaves, 2001). In this understanding of emotional geographies, changes can and have been made to better serve educators and students and produce more positive emotional experiences. Thus, working to attend to online emotional geographies with their unique infrastructures and interactions serves as an important way to improve the learning experiences of online instructors and students. Specifically, this research finds that the emotional geographies of Zoom classrooms are characterized by varying levels of permeability as the result of students managing the duality of place and space.
Each student is in a separate, physical place riddled with its own potential distractions as was demonstrated in the findings. However, each student was also asked to participate in an online space. As the permeability of student and instructor places varied, elements from the physical place inevitably were called into the online space through spouses, dogs, roommates, internet reliability, and other technologies. Similarly, online spaces existed within students’ individual places. The online space was made relevant as students chose to navigate conversations and relationships with external others about the Zoom classroom or the content within it. This duality of place and space suggests that students are managing complex identities in real time as their physical place may call for students to act one way while the online space may call for a different set of expectations. This duality increases the emotional load required to participate and increase the amount of emotion work required for dispositional changes to occur within critical multicultural education courses.

The duality of students and instructors navigating physical places and online spaces simultaneously exemplified the theory of transactional distance or feelings of perceived distance between oneself and others in online settings. Students managed their visibility through the Zoom infrastructure in ways that were different from in-person spaces. Students saw other members of their class through the platform and managed camera angles, Zoom backgrounds, and the mute button to limit what information was available about themselves to others. In contrast, comments made in physical classrooms to others before, during, or after class may allow students and instructors to inquire into one another’s lives in more personal or one-on-one ways. However, informal comments and interactions such as these were much more difficult in a Zoom setting as others may be passive observers of the private conversation. Additionally, personal information acquired throughout the Zoom classrooms most often occurred as the
permeability of a student or instructor’s environment was made visible by the camera. In this sense, students and instructors were observers of their classmates' physical lives through the online space.

Passively observing a classmate's physical place through an online space also suggests how navigating the duality of place and space implicates the body. Each student is in a physical place and reacting to content, their peers, and the instructor in physical, embodied ways. Embodied ways of generating feedback were often exaggerated as head shakes, nods, thumbs up, smiles, and laughter. However, the embodiment of the physical place was also disembodied within the online space. For example, the smiles, laughs, gasps, and jaw droppings students physically demonstrated in their own bodies were often missed unless the instructor was specifically looking for student expressions or another student happened to catch another’s reaction. In Zoom classrooms, students cannot make their bodies bigger by waving their arms or smaller by slouching in a chair; the Zoom photo square remains the same size regardless of the emotional embodied response. However, these instructors relied on the physical, embodied responses from students to know if they should continue lecturing, ask a question, or take a break. Requiring the body to be responsive in a disembodied space is a curious challenge as a physical body must navigate two environments simultaneously. This suggests that instructors must find new ways to gauge the emotional responses of students in online classrooms as embodied responses are often too nuanced to unpack when one student occupies a single square on the instructor’s computer.

The duality of physical place, online space, and the presence of the body is unique to the emotional geography of online Zoom classrooms. While physical emotional geographies require instructors and students to manage their bodies and feelings of emotional closeness or distance
physically, online emotional geographies are structured with transactional distance because of the place-space duality and are required to simultaneously manage their bodies in space and place. This duality of place, space, and (dis)embodiment suggests that instructors and students are required to perform more emotional and cognitive work to become present than their in-person counterparts.

**Permeability**

As students decreased their level of permeability, feelings of transactional distance also decreased. For example, students frequently relocated themselves to an environment, often with physical walls separating oneself from others, to create a less permeable place to interact with the online class. However, not all students are afforded a place alone and without distractions. For some students, access to adequate internet is not often available, noise levels were often beyond their control, and distractions were often present as they share a living space with roommates, spouses, or friends.

For all students, instructors can facilitate ways to lessen the permeability of the classroom and decrease transactional distance. For example, instructors could facilitate a less permeable physical boundary by implementing or encouraging the use of headphones. Headphones create a physical, embodied boundary around the online space as the use of headphones indicates to external others that they are 1) not available and are 2) confining the classroom discussion to only those within online space. These external boundaries are especially important in critical multicultural education courses as headphones can confine the conversation within the classroom and allow students the ability to emotionally process without external others commenting on the content (Cutri, Whiting, & Bybee, 2020).
The permeability of the Zoom classroom was not always a physical one. For example, cell phones were ever-present throughout these Zoom classrooms. Through the presence of cell phones and technology in their physical places, students may be navigating additional online spaces through their technology during Zoom class. These students did so as they interacted with others via social media, texting, or other communication tools further disembodying themselves from their physical space. Returning in and out of two online spaces while remaining in one physical place contributed to limited participation from students increasing feelings of transactional distance.

Additionally, navigating two different online spaces concurrently may not only disembody students from their physical place, but may also increase transactional distance between oneself and one’s own body. This could implicate a difficulty for students to recognize the affectual responses to institutionalized oppression in online critical multicultural education courses in their own body and become unable to do the emotion work required to create dispositional change. More scholarship inquiring into the transactional distance between oneself and one’s own body using multiple online spaces could be a future research step investigating the nuances in the emotional geographies of the online space.

While there are challenges accompanied by the Zoom space, the permeability of online emotional geographies also affords instructors and students opportunities that in-person classes do not. Previous research has described asynchronous, online classes as “fishbowls” where students cannot run and where everyone can see the comments made on an online platform (Conrad, 2002, p. 207). However, because of the duality of place and space, the Zoom classrooms in this study showed students entering and leaving the classroom via their cameras at will. While at times increasing transactional distance for the instructor, the permeability of
entering and leaving Zoom may also provide students the opportunity to withdraw from difficult conversations and embody affectual feelings in real time. Managing emotional responses without conforming social pressures of expressing or concealing one’s emotion appropriately while in the presence of others like their in-person peers can facilitate learning and dispositional work (Hatt, 2012). When recognized as an affordance of Zoom, this ability for students to acknowledge affect and manage emotional work constructively may prove helpful for instructors when trying to facilitate dispositional change. More research about how students manage their presence on Zoom would help generate strategies for teachers to recognize affectual responses and structure support for students to perform productive emotional work in online settings.

In private interviews, instructors mentioned the emotional fatigue they felt Zoom exerted on themselves and insisted that they would not like to teach in an online platform again. These feelings of fatigue often seeped into comments about their disdain for the online platform to their students. Feeling fatigued was a hidden emotional toll deriving from feelings of transactional distance and being unable to connect with students in ways they had done previously in in-person classes. This could be connected to a lack of support or preparation to teach within a novel online space with a different emotional geography as compared to in-person teaching spaces (Cutri & Mena, 2020). In other words, the teaching tools they had cultivated to connect with students in-person, did not translate into the online space of Zoom. As a result, instructors often felt a sense of insecurity as they were unable to gauge the emotional reactions of their students. These feelings of increased transactional distance and insecurity suggest that the emotions of online spaces were carried into the physical places of instructors well after the Zoom session had ended. Additionally, while the scope of this data was limited to the Zoom video screens, the feelings within the online space were also carried into the physical places of students
as evidenced by conflicts with spouses. While this study was not privy to those conversations, it may be safe to assume that the conflict between spouses that arose in this data did not end when the Zoom classroom ended. Thus, while physical place could be permeated with emotions and distractions that seeped into the online space, feelings of transactional distance, conflict, and insecurities in the online space could also linger with the participants well after the conclusion of the online class. Investigating how the emotions of the online space linger and infiltrate the physical places of students and instructors remains an area for future research.

Finally, instructors need to be aware that many of the ways they have previously connected with students may not be available in Zoom classrooms and new strategies for online participation and interaction are needed. As instructors embrace new possibilities in the online space, they can adapt to the new Zoom emotional geography by creating intentional ways for students to share about themselves in the online platform. For example, while instructors may inquire into the personal lives of their students in one-on-one settings during in-person classes, Zoom classrooms offer instructors and students the chance to perform show and tell with physical items, to learn about the physical place each student is Zooming from, and perhaps be introduced to the people a student lives with and acknowledge how those external people may be affecting the Zoom classroom.

**Affective Economies**

As the Zoom classroom was described as non-emotional and non-relational by the instructors and students, it stands that when emotion emerged in the online classroom, it was greeted as something that held power to increase or decrease transactional distance. This became relevant as teachers and students chose to give (or withhold) emotion gifts and perform (or resist) emotion work. Specifically, the emotional transactions held power as they were exchanged for
increased (or decreased) closeness to the instructor who held institutional power in the classroom. Therefore, emotion work, performances, and gifts operated as currency and could be exchanged within an affective economy.

Reconceptualizing participation as a source of emotional currency in an online affective economy can help online instructors as they design and structure their courses. Specifically implementing moments for students to share about themselves, events occurring in their own personal lives, and the discussion of non-academic and academic content between groups of students and between the instructor and students may work to build a form of emotional credit between participants in online courses. For example, having opportunities to laugh and share information about oneself with others in smaller group settings may enable students to feel more comfortable sharing in the large group discussion. Additionally, as this study removed the opportunity for students to privately chat with one another via Zoom, I was unable to look at how the private chat feature could work to decrease transactional distance between students. However, utilizing the personal chat feature could provide these personal touchpoints in the instructor-student and student-student relationships that evidently worked to close transactional distance in this study. Opportunities to explore the ways emotion gifts or performances are given and received in the private chat between participants is another source of future research. Finally, opportunities to exchange emotion gifts with peers may also lead to decreased feelings of transactional distance and increased participation – giving emotion gifts back to the instructor.

Future research exploring transactions of emotional credit, gifts, and work between online instructors and students may further a more comprehensive theory of online emotional geographies.
Many of the emotion gifts and performances given and received by instructors and students were performed by the body within the small lens of the computer camera. These included smiles, laughter, nods, head shakes, and when a student verbally participated at a higher rate than their peers. This highlights the physical body as relevant in both place and space as physical gestures within the lens of the camera were used to secure and exchange emotion gifts and performances. Therefore, the decisions students make to leave one’s camera on or off and the appearance of the body have significant consequences in increasing or decreasing transactional distance. Further research is needed to investigate how the physical body plays a role in the emotional transaction and experiences of instructors and students in online classrooms.

Lastly, the ability to exchange emotion gifts and performances within online spaces through the chat feature of Zoom was also significant as it allows students to perform the emotion work necessary to translate one’s thoughts into words and to be “nice” when doing so. Generally, students want to be nice people in online settings when they must frequently interact with them (Conrad, 2002). For example, when conflict or disagreements occurred, students manage the conflict using hedging terms in the chat such as the use of “haha” or smiley faces or the overuse of question marks. In doing so, students were performing niceness as they made comments recognizing the opinions of others and asserting their own opinion in response. Additionally, texting language available to students was often casual in its grammar conveying a familiarity between students and perhaps lowering the transactional distance between students. These findings agree with Conrad (2002) who has explored the performance of niceness in asynchronous classrooms. However, this study suggests that further exploring the contours of niceness norms in synchronous, Zoom courses may prove useful to instructors and students.
Gendered Framing of the Body

As Zoom, or other online forums, become a new normal in the post-pandemic world, this study suggests that primary frames, including gender, still distinctly underlie the interactions between instructors, students, and their peers. Specifically, instructors made meaning about their own experiences in contrast to potential others that they perceive as not “touchy feely” as better suited for teaching in online formats. Comments such as these revealed how instructors perceived online class to be non-relational and non-emotional and being organized with high amounts of transactional distance. Additionally, as they described themselves as “touchy feely” it also suggests a belief that being in tune with one’s affectual responses to the transactional distance between the instructor and the students was a disadvantage. Furthermore, it highlights how emotions have historically been perceived as personal style or as a nuisance to be managed by women outside of the regular system rather than expressed or considered as valuable sources of information broadly applicable and relevant (Boler, 1999; Butler, 1990; Cahill, 2007; Hochschild, 2012).

Gendered dynamics of student participation also emerged as a relevant finding within online emotional geographies. Specifically, when men were present in the Zoom classroom, it appeared that they felt less discouraged from interrupting a comment made by the professor or another student to add their voice. Additionally, they made verbal comments at a disproportional rate when compared to the women in the class pointing to socially conditioned gender expectations for men to assert their opinion whereas women should be “nice” (Boler, 1999; Butler, 1990; Hochschild, 1979, 2012). However, when there were only women in the class, participation did not seem to disperse itself among the participants. In contrast, the elementary level course participation was monopolized by five of the 18 women in the classroom. Neither
instructor seemed to notice these inequitable and disproportionate levels of verbal participation. This finding suggests that the norms of Zoom participation favor those who assert themselves, an androcentric approach to education. However, Zoom norms are being generated each time a new group of people meet on the platform. Therefore, instructors have a tremendous power to generate new Zoom norms of social interaction that can more equitably provide opportunities for student participation. These include suggestions such as: actively encouraging students to use the chat feature of Zoom and incorporating chat comments into the discussion, establishing how students are to indicate they have a question or comment, utilizing the breakout rooms for shorter periods of time with specific questions, choosing a group leader to start breakout room discussions and ensuring opportunities for every student to share their opinion, and keeping notes related to which students do not share in the Zoom classroom and specifically inviting them to do so or asking them about their hesitations or barriers to participation.

The gendered framing of students was also evidenced as multiple identities collided within their physical place and online space for female, married students. While students participating in in-person courses may have to navigate the identity of being a wife, with its accompanying social pressures, and being a student, they do so in separate places, and not usually simultaneously. Additionally, the sometimes-polarizing topics in multicultural education courses may be particularly challenging with this overlap of simultaneous place and space as students confront emotional and at times identity disruptive ideas. The emotional and identity disruptive experiences of the course may require some students to contend with conflicting identity frames as students within a Zoom space and as wives within their physical place concurrently. Students who are unable to physically separate themselves in time and place to grapple with multiple identities may become subjected to the opinions of those they care about.
but who, as non-participants in the class, may also be uninformed in the theory, experiences, and vocabulary of social justice topics. Future research is needed to better understand how the gendered frames of wife may be experienced in online emotional geography spaces. While instructors are unable to control whether a spouse is present and commentating on the lesson, one suggestion may be to prepare students to have conversations with the people they live with or ask students to delay speaking with others about the topics of the day’s lesson for a set amount of time. This may also prove to be another situation where using headphones may prove valuable.

While student bodies experienced colliding frames of wife and student, both instructors experienced their motherhood framing within the Zoom space. Seldom appearing intentionally, frames of motherhood emerged for Gabrielle in more salient ways than for Elaine. Gabrielle, a mother of young children teaching from home, was more imminently aware of her framing as mother when children interrupted class. She appeared to be flustered or embarrassed when her framing as mother became visible to her students. This problematizing of motherhood within the online Zoom classroom supports the “widely-shared cultural beliefs [that] associate primary caretakers with lower status and lesser general competence (beyond the specialized realm of nurturance) compared to similar others who are not in the mother role” (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004, p. 697). The problematizing of motherhood in this study supports emerging research regarding the experiences of working mothers in academia during the COVID-19 pandemic and the unique challenges they face (Motherscholar et al., 2021; Cutri & Mena, 2020; Feinauer et al., 2022; Kasymova et al., 2021; Platt et al., 2022). Further exploration on how motherhood is experienced and managed by instructors in online settings may provide valuable insight into the additional emotional load mothers carry with them into online workspaces (Motherscholar et al., 2021; Cutri & Mena, 2020; Feinauer et al., 2022; Platt et al., 2022; Ridgeway, 2004).
Limitations and Conclusions

This study sought to characterize the online emotional geographies of Zoom spaces with their affordances and challenges. As this study is limited to a single case spanning a 7-week period and confined to two critical multicultural education online classrooms, it is not intended to be generalized across all synchronous online academic spaces. Survey research exploring the extent to which the tensions found here are widespread across classes of all kinds would build upon the findings presented here. Further, this microethnography is helpful for observing some behavior in real time, but interviews, focus groups, or like methods might also elaborate or provide additional insight into what this experience is like for students and instructors more fully. This project acts as a beginning look at the emotional geography of online synchronous class. However, continuing research is needed across various online classroom spaces to further understand the dynamics of online emotional geographies across academic contexts over longer academic periods.

However, findings from this study do raise questions about online emotional geographies characterized by the duality of place and space, the presence of transactional distance, and the (dis)embodiment of instructors and students. These characteristics are unique to Zoom and require instructors to consider new pedagogies and techniques as they develop communities of online learning. Additionally, this study generates a theory of online emotional geographies that suggest instructors be attuned to the levels of permeability, emotional transactions, and gender frames present in their own and students’ physical places and online spaces.

This study also suggests that a theory of online affective economies may prove useful to understanding the ways in which instructors and students become emotionally distanced or closer to one another. Additionally, the emotional experiences of instructors and students suggest that
synchronous online classes are emotionally fatiguing. Therefore, understanding how to exchange forms of emotional currency for decreased transactional distance may lead to more positive experiences and encourage instructors to willingly take up the task to teach in online spaces (Cutri & Mena, 2020; Cutri, Mena, & Whiting, 2020).

Finally, this study also raises explicit attention to attending to gender, marital status, and motherhood as relevant frames in online learning is required for online spaces (Bradley & Oldham, 2020; Motherscholar et al., 2021; Cutri & Mena, 2020; Feinauer et al., 2022; Platt et al., 2022). As the body is in a physical place and an online space, students and instructors are often simultaneously navigating complex relationships and identities in real time. This suggests future research attending to how social frames may bleed from physical place to online space and vice versa. More understanding how gender frames collide and are visible, or made invisible, to the online space and their implications on learning in Zoom environments is needed. Additionally, future research is also needed to understand how frames of race, class, and other identifying social frames may also emerge and intersect in online Zoom classrooms.
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## APPENDIX B

### Instruments

**Code Book**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1 - A Priori Codes</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Performances</td>
<td>Shaking heads during stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specifically asking if that made a student feel ________ emotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-performances - laughing, not responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Gifts</td>
<td>Commenting on the personal - birthdays, haircuts, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validation or exaggerated agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laughing or smiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Positioning in Class</td>
<td>Camera angles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When cameras come on and off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location of student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoom Infrastructure</td>
<td>Specifically commenting about Zoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noting Wait Time between questions and answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2 - Open, inductive coding</td>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Identities</td>
<td>Managing professional identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing Student Identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Subcategory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Gender Identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological supports for Emotion Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physicality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Technology</td>
<td>Chat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phones/Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 3 - Final codes</td>
<td>Consolidated codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries</td>
<td>Managing Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External permeability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal rigidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physicality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Positioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zoom Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Transactions</td>
<td>Ideological supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotion Gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotion Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Identity Management</td>
<td>Managing Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing Student Identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing Professionality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C

**Camera and Participation Data**

**Table C1**

*General Participation Information for Both Courses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Section</th>
<th>Class Period</th>
<th># Cameras Turning Off</th>
<th># Total Comments</th>
<th>% Comments made by men</th>
<th>% Comments made by BIPOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Section</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C2

*Comments by Person in the Elementary Course Over the 5 Class Periods*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>BIPOC - Y/N</th>
<th>Class Period 1</th>
<th>Class Period 2</th>
<th>Class Period 3</th>
<th>Class Period 4</th>
<th>Class Period 5</th>
<th>Average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tira</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ava</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlyn</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vickie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayeli</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C3

Comments by Person in the Secondary Course Over the 5 Class Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>BIPOC - Y/N</th>
<th>Class Period 1</th>
<th>Class Period 2</th>
<th>Class Period 3</th>
<th>Class Period 4</th>
<th>Class Period 5</th>
<th>Average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanez</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>